

*Attorney docket TOP 348***REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 have been amended. Claims 4-9 were allowed. Claims 10-13 are amended to all depend from allowed claim 4. New claims 14-18 are allowable for the reasons below.

Claim 1 has been amended by adding a capacitive device coupled between the second input terminal and an input voltage. Support for the amendment is shown in FIG. 9, wherein an inverting input terminal is coupled to an input voltage via a capacitor C_{41} .

Claim 1 and allowed Claims 4 and 7 have been amended by changing terminal names of the operational amplifier; no subject matter has been added. It is noted that this amendment of Claim 1, and the amendment of allowed Claims 4 and 8, is not for overcoming any rejection.

Claims 2-3 and allowed Claims 5-6 and 8-9 have been amended by adding the term "approximately." It is noted that this amendment of Claim 2-3 and allowed Claims 5-6 and 8-9 is for clarity, not for overcoming any rejection.

Claims 10-13 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 4 and its related claims. Support for the amendment of Claim 10 is shown in FIG. 10, of Claim 11 in FIG. 6, of Claim 12 in FIG. 8, and of Claim 13 in FIG. 12. No new subject matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claims 1-3, and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schlotterer et al. (U.S. 5,525,985). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an amplifier circuit comprising an operational amplifier having a first input terminal coupled to a common node, a second input terminal, and an output terminal; *a capacitive device coupled between the second input terminal and an input voltage*; and a resistor network comprising a plurality of stages connected serially, coupled between the second input terminal and the output terminal, wherein each stage of the resistor network comprises an input node; an output node; a first resistor coupled between the input node and the common node; and a second resistor coupled between the input node and the output node.

AMENDMENT

10

10/748,667

Attorney docket TOP 348

However, Schlotterer does not teach or suggest *a capacitive device coupled between the second input terminal and an input voltage*. In FIG. 3 of Schlotterer, there is no capacitive device coupled to the second input terminal.

For this reason, *inter alia*, the Applicant believes that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference, along with its dependent claims 2-3.

35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 2-3, and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aswell (U.S. 6,703,682 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


The Applicant believes that claims 2-3 are allowable by their dependency from claim 1, which is allowable due to the reasons stated above.

New Claims. The new claim 14 recites, in part, "a capacitive device coupled between the second input terminal and the output terminal". The Applicant believes that it is clear that these limitations are not taught by the cited references. For this reason, *inter alia*, the Applicant believes that claim 14 is allowable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and its related claims, they are also allowable.

Conclusion. The Applicant has made every effort to place the present application in condition for allowance. For the reasons above, the Applicant requests allowance of all the claims. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the present application and his allowance of claims 4-9.

Respectfully submitted,

August 19, 2005
Date


Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)
(717) 426-1664
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax : (202) 408-0924

AMENDMENT

11

10/748,667